

Vipont Mines Ltd. Box 267 Oakley, Idaho 83346 November 16, 1978

State of Utah--Attn. Cleon Feight, Director Department of Natural Resources Divison of Oil, Gas and Mining 1588 West North Temple Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

Dear Mr. Feight:

I consider the threatening letter dated November 8, 1978 from you (author unknown) unbecoming to you and your department.

Your employee's attitude (Mr. Daniels) is one of hounding me to the point of servitude because of his interpretation of the Act. As I mentioned to you before, and I shall state again, Mr. Daniel's background and understanding of what is needed is sorely lacking. He does not seem to grasp the intention of reclamation or hard-rock mining in the least.

A Mr. Michael Thompson, who visited the property and subsequently wrote a letter to me dated July 12, 1978, was trespassing.

We mutually agreed that any visits on the property would first be accompaniedby notifying me, not some drop-in, casual thing as has been done in the past. I also made it clear that no discussions are to be made to my employees when I am not present.

Among other things, unless your people are qualified in mine safety, as prescribed by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, they should not be allowed on the property again. This would constitute a trespass.

I filed the forms Mr # 1 & 2 as required September 1, 1977, and additional forms November 6, 1978. The latter included valuable confidential information, which I believe is wrong for you to have.

You must also recall the Vipont Mine area is pravately owned land, as is virtually all of the land surrounding it.

Furthermore, I believe that your department has over-stepped its basic authority in that Sec. 40-8-5 (3) your inspectors seem to be abrogating or interfering in the state health department's functions. I have gotten along fine with their department and see no problems in the future.

I will futher state that I am certainly more concerned with the care and keeping of my land or neighboring land than you or your inspectors are and will take precautions to preserve it the best I can.

Incidentally, your threatening letter to me makes a- general statement, that you need more information etc., but does not say what is needed. Please inform me.

Your department is being discriminating to me by its unreasonable approach by unqualified field men.

When I met you last summer and discussed some of the approaches to the new Act, you seemed cooperative and willing to be reasonable. However the acts of your inspectors do not reflect that attitude.

I have made telephone calls to your office and have always found you absent; no return calls have been made to me.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas F. Mill-er

and the second of the second o

and the state of t

omas miller